DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 326 SO 000 297

AUTHOR East, Maurice A.
TITLE Political Scientists and Teacher Education: An Inservice Program in International Affairs.
INSTITUTION American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 70
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Political Science Education Project Panel, American Political Science Association meeting, Los Angeles, California, September 8, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
DESCRIPTORS College Teachers, Inservice Teacher Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), *International Education, Material Development, *Models, *Political Science, Political Socialization, Professional Associations, *Secondary School Teachers, Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS (CTIR), *Center for Teaching International Relations

ABSTRACT

To introduce the inservice program the author argues in favor of involving discipline-oriented professors and professional associations in the teaching of their discipline in the secondary schools, but also discusses the problems to be avoided in such involvement. The inservice program described is being carried out by the Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), an organizational unit of the Graduate School of International Studies, Denver University (DU). (Other CTIR programs are also listed.) The inservice programs take three forms: 1) extended inservice institutes at DU, offering graduate credit, at which participants develop classroom-oriented materials in international affairs; 2) 3-day regional institutes throughout Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, at which participants are introduced to CTIR classroom materials; and, 3) 2 to 3 day national institutes. The short-term institutes use "Rowan and Martin's 'Laugh-In' format" as a planning model. "The objective was to provide the participant with ideas, materials, and even units which were ready for the classroom." (A typical schedule of these is included and described.) Institute staff members were primarily discipline-oriented professors who generally lacked formal secondary teaching experience. (DJB)

ED044326

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND TEACHER EDUCATION:

AN INSERVICE PROGRAM IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Maurice A. East

Graduate School of International Studies
University of Denver

SP 000 297

September, 1970

A paper presented at a panel of the American Political Science Association meeting in Los Angeles, September 8, 1970. This panel was organized by the Political Science Education Project of the APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education.

The purpose of this paper is to report to my colleagues in the political science profession about one inservice teacher training program for secondary school teachers. This program happens to be concerned primarily with improving the teaching of international studies in the high schools, but hopefully, the example will be applicable to other sectors of the discipline as well.

A prior question might well be asked: what stake does the college or university professor (or his discipline-oriented professional association) have in the teaching of political science at the secondary level in the first place? Several answers can be offered. First, the thrust of "the new social studies" in the schools has been to include more and more material from the social sciences in the curriculum. There is also an increasing emphasis upon the structures of the disciplines and the ways that social scientists go about doing their work.[1] To the extent that persons in higher education are concerned about the attitudes toward and information about their disciplines which students bring to college social science classes, they should be concerned about the teaching of social studies at the pre-collegiate level.

It is interesting to note at this juncture that discipline-oriented professional associations traditionally have not played a major role in either the pre-service or in-service training of teachers. One report stated it as follows:

> "Teacher education in-service is the cooperative responsibility of the colleges which prepare teachers pre-service, the state departments of education . . . , various professional organizations whose purposes include the professional improvement of its members, and the local school districts . . ."[2]

Reading the entire report makes it clear that the colleges referred to are primarily colleges of education, and the professional organizations are professional <u>teachers'</u> organizations and not discipline-oriented professional associations.[3]

A second type of answer may be even more important. Given the constraints placed upon the secondary school teacher in terms of time available for preparation and presentation of the material and the characteristics of the student body, any persons attempting to affect the school curriculum must come to grips with some basic questions about what in the discipline is most important to teach and how can it be presented most effectively. A typical problem might be the following: What is most important to teach tenth graders about Latin American politics given five 45-minute periods of classwork? I am suggesting that by coping with this problem, political scientists would be forced to ask some questions about the subject matter and about methods of teaching that would be most challenging. The process of coping with such problems would force persons to evaluate a field and make some hard decisions regarding emphases and priorities, and this would be beneficial to the individual scholar and to the profession as a whole.

A third answer to the question might also be offered. It is based on the fact that a very large proportion of the population receives no college education. Thus, if there is any value whatsoever to society in teaching people about

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

politics, there is an obligation to reach those persons who do not enter the higher education system.[4] With reference to international studies, the point was made quite clearly in the final report of a New England inservice project.

> "Since most Americans still do not go to college and most Americans do not travel abroad, they have little opportunity to gain understanding of other peoples and their cultures. There is more emphasis now than before on undergraduate and graduate programs in non-Western studies and language-and-area studies. However, these programs do not reach students below the college level. Thus, the task of providing instruction for the majority of students remains."[5]

In summarizing, there are three reasons why college professors and their discipline-oriented professional associations should be concerned with teaching at the secondary level. First, secondary schools are beginning to deal more and more with the various disciplines (especially in the social studies). Second, by confronting the situation facing the secondary teacher--limited time and resources as well as the diversity of interest and ability levels of the students--the profession will have to identify the essentials and assess the effectiveness of alternative teaching strategies. And finally, in order to reach a large proportion of the population, we must extend our efforts beyond the higher education system and into the pre-collegiate level.

After making the argument in favor of more interest and activity on the part of professors and professional associations in the teaching of political science at the secondary level, it is necessary to say something about the problems involved in this course of action. Although no tried and true solutions will be presented here, it is hoped that by pointing some of these out they can be avoided, at least to some degree.

First, there is a difference in objectives and purpose. College professors often define their role as that of bearer of new knowledge coming directly from the frontiers of the discipline. On the other hand, secondary personnel are more interested in hearing a more detailed account of some of the less current knowledge which is just beginning to trickle down into the secondary school curriculum. This gap between the frontiers of research and secondary level teaching should not be of any great surprise to the college professor; a glance at the gap between research and college texts should be sufficient to make the point.

The operational consequences of this difference is that professors should not feel that giving a one-hour, one time lecture to a group of teachers on new ideas in some area of political science will be of great help to the secondary teacher. Perhaps a more useful function is to examine the materials currently being used in a unit and then adjusting his presentation to upgrade or enrich the materials they are already using.

This suggestion leads to another problem, most often voiced by the professor: he is unacquainted with the environment in which the secondary teacher operates and is therefore not qualified to give any advice. Although it may be true that professors are not acquainted with the literature and research documenting the

world of the classroom teacher,[6] nevertheless it is my contention that most professors can bring to bear much more information on the environment of the secondary teacher than they normally do. In other words, college professors often do not want to try thinking and operating within the framework of the secondary teacher. Any college professor who commits himself to working with secondary teachers should at a minimum attempt to conceptualize the environment of the teacher. Ideally, he should spend a considerable amount of time and resources in the process of becoming familiar with these basic facts, by personal observation as well as through the literature.

A third problem (which is in fact a result of the first two problems mentioned above) is that professors often ignore completely the process of translating knowledge into a form that can be used by the secondary teacher. Even good lectures given by professors cannot be used in most secondary classrooms. The level of generalization and abstraction is often too high for the students; hence, replaying a taped lecture is ineffective. And it is too much to expect teachers to do an adequate job of translating this material, given the limited amount of detailed background information they are likely to have on the subject. The background information they lack is precisely the information needed to make the judgments about importance and emphasis that the translation process requires.

Again, the plea is that professors who undertake such assignments for the secondary schools should devote time and resources to the task of translating the materials into a form usable in the classroom. Even if the resulting product is rough and crude in terms of teaching techniques, methods, etc., the teachers will still benefit greatly from having an example of how a specialist in the field would place priorities and assign importance to the material.

Finally, one can point to a different sort of problem--the shortage of college personnel outside of colleges of education interested in secondary level teaching. One of the major reasons for this shortage is that our professions have not traditionally provided adequate rewards for efforts in this direction. Writing a text for high school or elementary school use is considered less deserving of professional recognition than writing a text for use in college courses. Similarly, time spent upon the development and improvement of teaching has not received the same rewards as research.

There are some signs that this trend is beginning to reverse itself. The crises faced in higher education have forced more and more people to examine what is going on in the college classroom and to put great effort into improving that process.[7] One can also speculate that the impact of the "new social studies" on the secondary schools has put additional pressures on the colleges and universities to change venerable ways of educating students. It has traditionally been the case that pre-collegiate education was focused on "fundamentals", with the higher education system providing the "frills" such as concern with controversial issues, dealing with contemporary topics. This is no longer the case. It is not at all unusual for high school social studies classes to be dealing with contemporary and controversial issues. In addition, the high school class is likely to have participated in some sort of activity related to this, e.g., inductive teaching or simulation. No longer will the student sit in a lecture

hall and listen to a lecture on the bases of national power in which the instructor makes little or no reference to contemporary events.[8]

As the professor continues to look for ways to improve his teaching, he will be tempted to look toward the secondary schools for models to consider. In this manner, more and more members of the profession will become acquainted with the teaching of social studies at the secondary level.

Another sign that the profession is beginning to place increased emphasis on teaching in general and pre-collegiate education in particular is that both the American Political Science Association and the International Studies Association have recently formed major organizational units to deal specifically with these problems.[9]

A MODEL FOR IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING

Having outlined the reasons why higher education and professional associations should be interested in pre-collegiate education and having mentioned some of the problems encountered when higher education personnel attempt to work with teachers, I want to outline in some detail an inservice training program currently operating at the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS), University of Denver. This program is being supported by funds from the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

The program is in its second year and is just one of the activities being carried out by the Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), an organizational unit within GSIS. The purpose of CTIR is to upgrade and improve the teaching of international relations in secondary schools. In order to accomplish this purpose, CTIR is carrying on activities in four general areas: (1) Pre-service training, (2) Development of materials, (3) Communication and coordination, and (4) In-service training. Of these, in-service training activities utilize by far the greatest proportion of resources.

Before turning to the in-service program specifically, if will be useful to have a brief overview of the other types of activities of CTIR.

The pre-service training is under the provisions of the Prospective Teacher Fellowship (PTF) program. Under this program, GSIS accepts four students per year for graduate study in international relations. These students have completed their undergraduate work and have expressed an interest in teaching international relations at the high school level. The PTF program is a two-year program culminating in a Master's degree in international relations and state certification as a secondary social studies teacher.

In addition to the normal requirements for a Master's degree, the PTFs take the following courses: two quarters of Problems of Teaching International Relations at the Secondary Level (10 hours), Teaching in the Secondary School (8 hours), and Student Teaching (15 hours). The PTFs are also an integral part

of the various activities of CTIR, including the development and production of materials for classroom use.

During the past year, a shift in priorities by the Office of Education and by GSIS and CTIR has resulted in a reduction in the number of PTFs in the program and this program is likely to be phased out next year.

The development of materials by CTIR is the result primarily of the need for materials to be used in the in-service training programs. When the CTIR staff began to inventory materials for use in the in-service institutes, it became apparent that materials of the type envisioned were not readily available. The CTIR staff then began to produce various kinds of materials related to the teaching of international affairs. Included in the materials produced thus far are study guides, re-writes of articles and chapters of books, slide-tape presentations, film guides, simulations, role playing exercises, and inductive data confrontation type units.[10]

Communication and coordination among teachers and other educational personnel and agencies are carried out by the periodic CTIR Newsletter, published four to six times during the school year, and the Materials Distribution Center. The purpose of the Newsletter is to inform teachers of activities and materials useful to them in their work. The emphasis is upon materials and ideas which are comparative and analytic and can be applied to more than one teaching context. Topics such as revolution, modernization, authoritarianism, military intervention, international organization, conflict resolution, international systems, and decision-making are typical of the focus of the Newsletter. Another major section of the Newsletter is devoted to announcements of relevant meetings and activities of state, regional, and national interest.

The Materials Distribution Center has as its purpose facilitating the distribution and utilization of materials relevant to the teaching of international affairs. Because of the increasing cost of the newer materials utilizing more modern types of educational technology, there are many schools and school districts which do not have access to these expensive items. CTIR has established the Materials Distribution Center as a way to alleviate this problem. The distribution center includes a large number of films, filmstrips, tapes, simulations, and books, which are available to teachers in the Rocky Mountain region. Although use of the distribution center is not limited to persons who have participated in CTIR in-service training programs, in fact this group comprises the large proportion of all users of the center.

The in-service training programs have taken three general forms. One is the extended in-service institute which meets periodically throughout the school year and convenes either on the University of Denver campus or somewhere else in the Denver area. Participants are drawn almost exclusively from the Greater Denver area, and there is a close relationship between the institute participants, the CTIR staff, and the PTFs. Graduate credit is offered to participants in this institute. One of the requirements is that each participant develop some sort of classroom-oriented materials in the general area of international affairs.

The regional institutes are a second form of in-service program. These institutes usually last three days and are held in cities throughout Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, the region originally covered by CTIR. A major purpose of these institutes is to encourage the participants to utilize the resources of CTIR in their teaching. The Materials Distribution Center is heavily used by participants from these institutes, and the CTIR Newsletter serves as one of the major communications channels these people have with the wider social studies community.[11]

This coming year CTIR will hold several national institutes outside of the Rocky Mountain region. These institutes will be of two or three days' duration, and there will be less emphasis upon having these participants utilize CTIR resources. The reason for this is that financial limitations on CTIR make it impossible to serve the needs of the increased number of partidipants throughout the nation.

A major decision that had to be made in planning for these various institutes was concerning the level of investigation to be pursued. One alternative was to choose one (or at most two) topics and plan the institutes around these, thus giving the participants some in-depth work in a particular area. Another alternative was to focus on several topics while making the presentations in the form of self-contained units ready for use in the classrooms with little or no translation by the teacher.

After considerable discussion with educators around the country and within the staff, the decision was made to opt for the second alternative. The major reason for this decision was because it was assumed that no topic could be covered in sufficient depth in the two or three day sessions, and the result would then be that participants would not know enough about a topic to feel capable of developing their own materials or of carrying out the necessary translation process. Nor would the teachers have anything that was appropriate for use in the immediate classroom situation.

In a very real sense, Rowan and Martin's "Laugh In" format became the model for planning the institutes. No attempt was made to integrate the presentations except at the most general level of being useful when teaching about international affairs. The objective was to provide the participants with ideas, materials, and even units which were ready for the classroom. These were demonstrated as well as discussed, so that the teachers had first hand experience with the materials. Also, the general philosophy expressed throughout these institutes was that the materials could be used in several different contexts within the social science courses the participants were now teaching. For example, the slide-tape presentation on revolution would be appropriate for use in the unit on the American revolution in U.S. history, discussing the French revolution in world history, studying nationalism and the developing nations in a modern problems course, or even studying the racial situation in contemporary America in a sociology course.

It was not expected that every one of the eight or more presentations made in an institute would be equally useful to all participants. But because of

the "classroom ready" nature of the materials, it was assumed that each participant would be able to take two or three of the presentations and use them substantially intact in their on-going courses.[12]

There were several major differences between the organization of the Denver area institute and those conducted off campus and outside of the Denver area. First, because the Denver area institute was scheduled to meet throughout the year, it was possible to require the participants to do more preparation for the individual sessions.[13] Second, there was more possibility for follow-up activities by the staff. Third, it was often possible to devote an entire day to a given topic and to utilize consultants and specialists to a greater degree.

However, even the Denver institute was oriented toward classroom ready presentations and materials to a large degree. When an outside consultant or specialist was brought in, every attempt was made to complement his contribution with a companion presentation of some materials relevant to the topic that could be utilized in the classroom with little or no translation. Also, attempts were made to communicate to the outside consultant the importance of making his presentation relevant to a classroom teacher's world. This communication process with the consultants and specialists allowed the CTIR staff to integrate and coordinate the overall program with relative success. The shorter time available for the national and regional institutes precluded the use of outside consultants and specialists, although in several instances the presentations of outside consultants were used as part of other institute programs via the use of tapes and the borrowing of ideas and concepts.

By way of illustration, a typical schedule for one of the three day regional institutes is included. There are several features of this schedule which deserve comment (see Figure 1).

First, these institutes are generally held in motels. It is most desirable to have the institute participants roomed at the same motel, thus allowing for informal discussion and exchanges of ideas between participants and staff, as well as among the participants themselves.

It should be noted that every major presentation includes activities involving the teachers. Because the participants are usually occupied with some sort of activity during the presentations, it is important that they be provided with a complete set of notes on the presentation as well as copies of all materials used. This ensures that every participant has had personal experience with a unit and has a complete set of all materials. It was not unusual for a participant to receive more than 65 pages of mimeographed materials at one of the three day institutes.

Because most of the regional meetings are held in smaller cities and towns, the staff felt it important to bring a collection of materials that the participants could browse through. The collection for the regional institutes consists of over 300 book titles, 10-15 films, and numerous games, simulations, and filmstrips. These materials are usually displayed in a separate room, and this materials display room often becomes the central meeting place for the informal evening sessions.

FIGURE 1

A TYPICAL THREE-DAY IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

THURSDAY	
8:00 p.m.	Informal social evening with participants
FRIDAY	
8:30 a.m.	Introductory remarks and housekeeping chores
9:30	STARPOWER (a game)
11:45	Orientation to materials display
12:15	Lunch
1:30 p.m.	REVOLUTION (a slide-tape show with related activities)
3:15	MODERNIZATION (a unit using slides and data analysis techniques)
5:00	Adjourn
8:00	Informal session--materials display, previewing films and filmstrips
SATURDAY	
8:30 a.m.	An International Systems Approach to Contemporary World Politics (a lecture with film)
11:00	The CTIR Materials Distribution Center
12:00	Lunch
1:30 p.m.	LITTLE ISLAND (a film; activities focusing on aspects of conflict resolution)
3:30	AUTHORITARIANISM (a slide-tape presentation with related activities)
5:00	Adjourn
8:00	Informal session--run DANGEROUS PARALLEL (a simulation); preview films
SUNDAY	
9:00 a.m.	INTELLIGENCE GATHERING (a film and role playing exercise)
11:00	Evaluation and final remarks
12:30	Adjourn

It is most important to establish a proper atmosphere for the institutes. The tone should generally be one of collegial confrontation between staff and institute participants. Everyone is on a first-name basis from the outset, and every effort is made to maintain an informal and personal atmosphere. The staff is urged to discover good ideas from the participants, and these are then shared with others. At the same time, staff members are also circulating among the participants, probing them for evaluative comments about various presentations and aspects of the institutes. These constant attempts to obtain feedback seem to satisfy the participants to a large extent, even though the tight scheduling precludes any major changes in format during the institute.

The controversial nature of much of the material presented requires sufficient flexibility in the schedule to allow for prolonged discussions. Attempts to curtail or limit such discussions are frequently interpreted by some participants as attempts on the part of the staff to "propagandize." For example, the Revolution slide-tape show presentation tries to focus on various component factors necessary for a revolution--leadership, economic causes, political oppression, mobilization of the masses, a revolutionary ideology, etc.--by looking at the American, French, Russian, Chinese and Cuban revolutions. Frequently, the discussion centers on the issue of whether it is legitimate (or even morally right) to compare the American and Russian revolutions, even for analytic purposes. Attempts to stifle such discussions are likely to be misinterpreted. Furthermore, it is preferable to let both sides of such a discussion be expressed by the participants rather than have staff members consistently arguing one side or the other.

Although these institute programs are designed to be carried out by three persons, in several instances PTFs were also members of the staff. Our finding was that the more staff members on hand, particularly during informal sessions, the more successful the sessions were. The participants frequently discussed their own teaching problems and programs when confronted by an eager and interested staff member.

A final comment relating to the type of advice that participants were led to expect from staff members: With one exception, the associate director of CTIR, no member of the CTIR staff had any formal classroom teaching experience (except for short exposures while testing new materials). This was made known to the participants, along with information about the subject-matter areas each staff member was competent in. This helped to develop more realistic expectations of the staff in the minds of the participants. Furthermore, participants were urged to articulate their problems as clearly and specifically as possible. This meant that staff members rejected questions such as "What should I teach about international relations next year?" Only if the participants were able to articulate more clearly their problems could the staff serve a useful function. We could review a teacher's course outline and recommend other readings or materials. After hearing how a teacher handles a certain topic, it might be possible to give him <u>specific suggestions</u> in how he might alter or improve his unit.

This advising strategy also served to "protect" the staff member (and often the outside consultant) from being asked to comment or advise on areas completely outside of one's competence.

By way of conclusion, one should make some general comments about the role of political science and pre-collegiate education. There are several reasons why teachers and school administrators are becoming more interested in political science as a discipline. One, of course, is the situation facing American society as we begin the 1970's--civil unrest, a breakdown of law and order, disillusionment with the political process, and severe questioning and criticism of U.S. foreign policy. All of these issues clearly call for greater efforts by the educational system in the areas of civic and international education. Another is the trend toward more empirically-oriented political science, a trend which coincides with some of the thrusts of the new social studies. Finally, school systems are being studied as political systems by political scientists. The convergence of all these forces acts to put political science as a discipline in the spotlight. The knowledge and skills of political scientists are needed by teachers and educators, and as individuals and as a profession we must attempt to serve those needs.

FOOTNOTES

[1]This emphasis was made earlier by Jerome Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge, 1960). More recently, see Edwin Fenton, The New Social Studies (New York, 1967), pp. 11-17; and Joseph J. Schwab, "The Concept of the Structure of a Discipline," Educational Record, Vol. 43 (July, 1962), pp. 197-205.

[2]Fred Edmonds, J. R. Ogletree, and Pat W. Wear, In-Service Teacher Education: Crucial Processes in Educational Change (Lexington, 1966), pp. 19-20.

[3]There are several notable examples of professional associations sponsoring curriculum projects. The recently concluded and very successful High School Geography Project was sponsored by the Association of American Geographers. The Anthropology Curriculum Study Project is sponsored by the American Anthropological Association. And the project entitled Sociological Resources for Secondary Schools is sponsored by the American Sociological Association.

[4]The political socialization literature offers arguments and propositions relating political socialization in the schools to various aspects of political culture and political system stability. For a good selection of this literature, see Roberta S. Sigel, Learning About Politics (New York, 1970), especially her introductory remarks, pp. 3-14.

[5]John Henry Berne, Institute for Secondary School Teachers to Seek Methods of Increasing Intercultural Understanding, Final Report (Warrenton, Virginia, June 1969).

[6]Two useful works describing aspects of the world of the high school teacher are Harmon Zeigler, The Political World of the High School Teacher (Eugene, Oregon, 1966) and David F. Kellum, The Social Studies: Myths and Realities (New York, 1969). A popular but most revealing account is found in Bel Kaufman's Up the Down Staircase (Englewood Cliffs, 1965).

[7]Two recent examples are Jacques Barzun, The American University: How It Runs (New York, 1968) and Runkel, Harrison, and Runkel (eds.), The Changing College Classroom (San Francisco, 1969).

[8]Much of the cry for "relevance" among college students may be a result of this process of opening up the pre-collegiate curricula while college teaching styles and curricula have remained relatively static.

[9]The APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education was formed during the past year with Richard C. Snyder as chairman (although Snyder informs me that there have been numerous other APSA committees with a similar function in the past). The International Studies Association has recently formed a group concerned with the teaching of international studies with James M. Becker as chairman. The ISA group has recently made plans for the publication of a series of books on teaching international studies at the various levels of education.

[10]The development of materials by CTIR is not geared to commercial distribution at the present time. The elaborate pre-testing and evaluation of such materials before distribution would consume resources which are being spent elsewhere in the in-service training programs. Most materials are currently available in limited quantities in mimeographed form.

[11]This fact supports the point frequently made about the need to <u>demonstrate</u> materials if one expects them to be used. It is not enough to advertise materials or even to talk about them.

[12]All participants in CTIR in-service training programs were sent a nineteen-page questionnaire asking them to evaluate the overall institute as well as the individual presentations. These questionnaires are presently being put into machine readable form for analysis. These results will be reported in a forthcoming paper.

[13]Some of the most exciting work along these lines is being done under the direction of Alan F. Westin at the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, Teachers College, Columbia University.